

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are cancelled. Claims 8-11 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 8-11 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the claims were directed to two patentably distinct species and required, under 35 U.S.C. § 121, election of one of the two species for prosecution on the merits. In response, Applicants hereby elect the invention of Species 2, i.e., Fig. 1 which is read on by claims 8-11. The claims read on by species 1, claims 1-7, are cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application with claims readable on the non-elected species.

Turning now to the art rejections, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Morishita (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0075402). Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Morishita.

Claim 8 recites:

a second power conversion section including a primary side for receiving said direct current input voltage, and a secondary side isolated from said primary side for generating a power-supply voltage to be supplied to said backlight section[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Morishita neither disclose nor suggest a second power conversion section that includes a primary side for receiving said direct current input voltage, and the relied on sections of Morishita neither

disclose nor suggest a second power conversion section that includes a secondary side isolated from a primary side for generating a power-supply voltage.

Though the relied on sections of Morishita describe a lamp power supplying circuit (see Fig.1 and ¶ [0030]), the relied on sections of the reference do not disclose or suggest that such lamp power supplying circuit includes a primary side as defined in the above excerpt of claim 8 and do not disclose or suggest that such lamp power supplying circuit includes a secondary side as defined in the above excerpt of claim 8.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that the relied on sections of Morishita do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 8 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishita in view of Lin (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0212790). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Morishita for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of Lin do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Morishita.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishita in view of Weindorf (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135572). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 11 depends from claim 8 and is therefore distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Morishita for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of Weindorf do not cure the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Morishita.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant